

Section 13: Remnancy, Memory, and Temporal Terminology

13.1. Reconfiguring the Notion of the Past

In the framework of the transliminal being, we no longer understand time as a linear dimension absolute and universal to experience. Temporality undergoes a radical reformulation where distinctions between the past, present, and future are translated through the pure presence of the transliminal being situated within perpetual liminality.

The concept of the "past" in linear temporality is reconfigured within our framework:

There is an enclosure the transliminal being engages within and as.

The transliminal being is within and as that enclosure in the way it elastically surpasses itself through an open way of a phenomenon brought forward by a different enclosure.

This different enclosure contextualizes the enclosure the transliminal being is within and as.

The different enclosure has what we call remnants within and as the enclosure the transliminal being is within and as, since the enclosure the transliminal being is within and as is the open way of the phenomenal enclosure that is not the enclosure the transliminal being is within and as—it both is and is not, following the genealogical phenomenological structure of the being of beings.

13.2. Understanding "The Past" in Transliminal Terms

This is what we call "the past":

The way in which phenomena relate as being brought forward by a calling.

How they "go to mean" in the way they relate and therefore form an enclosure.

How they open the way from the way the transliminal being elastically bends out from its enclosure (the enclosure it is being within and as) and surpasses itself because it has the being of ekstastic elasticity.

In that ekstastic way of being in the enclosure it is within and as, the transliminal being relates the enclosure that opens the way and the enclosure that is the way through the opening of the enclosure it is being and not being, elastically bending beyond itself in its ekstastic way of being in the enclosure it is within and as.

13.3. Memory as Elastic Ekstastic Engagement

From this complex emerges what we call memory. Memory is the way the transliminal being elastically bends out from its ekstastic way of being in the enclosure it is within and as, into the enclosure that opens the way for the transliminal being to be the related enclosure it is within and as. It becomes within and as the enclosure that opens the way for the enclosure it is within and as, in the way that the enclosure that opens the way has remnancy in the enclosure it is within and as, by the way it opens the way to be that enclosure.

Therefore, it becomes imperative to refrain from terms of linear temporality such as "previous", "currently", "current", or "present". These terms imply successive moments. The concept of "moment" does not enter the conversation in The Transliminal Ontologic until we discuss Reflexive Impermanation, which allows us to talk in terms of linear time while maintaining the ontological structure of temporality in the being of the transliminal being.

13.4. The Use of "This" and "That"

This is why we use terms like "different" and rely on articles such as "this" and "that". This approach plays into the being-not-being liminality of the transliminal being.

Interestingly, both situationality and potentiality-to-be share this same fundamental structure and are distinct only in how the transliminal being's enclosure expresses and articulates itself in terms of relationships between enclosures:

Situationality is an articulation and expression of an enclosure's relationship to phenomena as they are brought forward by a call (which opens the way).

Potentiality-to-be is an articulation and expression of an enclosure's relationship to ways open (which are opened by phenomena brought forward by a call).

These two are distinct because of stepping forth (bringing forward by a call) and open ways (phenomena opening the way toward other phenomena in their own call to bring forward phenomena).

13.5. Replacing Terms of Motion

Lastly, we must refrain from using terms such as "move" or "movement". Within the framework of the transliminal ontologic and the methodological approach of phenomenological genealogy, we replace terms of motion with terms like "express", "articulate", or "unfold" (though "unfold" is less favorable).

Therefore, memory is not the "ongoing movement" but an expression of how enclosures (networks of related phenomena that signify a calling) relate and how the transliminal being engages within and as this way of relating. The engagement centers on the remnancy between different enclosures.

Section 14: The Transliminal Temporality of the Question

14.1. The Expectation of an Answer

When a question is posed, an expectation arises—that there is an answer. An answer presupposes that the question was raised with the intention of bringing closure. A question set with the expectation that it can be closed, guided by an engagement with it as closable, effectively centers closure as its focal point. Thus, the hermeneutic enclosure engaged in this kind of question must find, in every way it is approached within this style of questioning, the means to signify "final" (answer), "only one" (answer), "the" (answer). What fundamentally calls out in this manner? What begs to be responded to, or even insists upon its own response?

14.2. The Demand for a Singular Response

What insists upon its own response when calling forth "the only answer"? The very question that seeks one answer holds the unique privilege of being the style of question it aims to address—namely, a question that looks for one answer. Does this, then, prompt further reflection and knowledge about whether this style of question can come to know itself, or indeed, whether any question can come to know itself? As long as we hold "the Question" within an existential perspective, does this not call forth, at the very least, insight into the horizon of potential responses—attunements or ways to turn toward—that lead back to the principal matter of concern we are raising?

14.3. The Being of Closedness

In a question that presupposes a singular response, the pathway toward closure is centered throughout. If the matter of concern is the question to be closed, and the

style of questioning is likewise to be closed, then the ultimate call we are raising, as a phenomenon, is that which directs our being toward the being of closedness.

If, in each phenomenon we engage with, we attune ourselves toward the call of the being to which they belong—as is necessary if we are ontologically grounded and liminally oriented—then our being (our way of being) becomes attuned to the being of closedness. Should we then, in calling forward from the mode of Dasein (Heidegger's term for human existence), examine the ways in which we are closed? This would only be unnecessary if there were no variable components in the situation we are examining.

14.4. Attunement Toward the Undisclosed

A question inherently calls for an attunement toward what remains undisclosed. The very nature of the question's call is an orientation toward undisclosed being. Therefore, if the style of the question—assuming it is a style and not the phenomenon's general temperament—concerns closedness, then the being of this phenomenon is not entirely undisclosed, except in terms of what remains contained within it.

Being a being of closedness, yet oriented toward undisclosed being, it reveals itself as already possessing a definite shape. This constitutes the "expectation" within its experience: in the way it calls, it does so from the outset within the realm of spatiality—that is, with definite form and shape. Consequently, a shadow is pre-cast by a question that expects an answer. And if there is a shadow, then there must be something standing in the way of the light.

14.5. The Pre-Cast Shadow of Expectation

The structure of a question that expects one answer experiences a shadow pre-cast by what obstructs the light. The puzzling aspect is this pre-cast shadow—the structure of expectation. Is this structure, this experience, what calls for our concern? For those to whom such a question is posed, the shadow becomes the concern.

But when the question turns upon itself, and we attempt to define precisely what casts the shadow, who is to respond if not the pre-cast definitive shape itself? The assumption has been made that there is a calling that insists on a response within this phenomenon that demands one response. To insist on one response from what insists on one response suggests we have already received our answer—that it insists upon one response. This seems redundant and perhaps even trivial.

However, by turning the question upon itself and adopting an ontological-existential perspective, we arrive at an insistence upon a response that belongs to the existing phenomenon—ourselves. When we acknowledge that the pre-cast shadow has something standing in the way to give it shape, and that this something is the existing being itself, we reorient ourselves toward further refinement and understanding.

14.6. The Ontological Attunement to Disclosure

Thus, the attunement toward the undisclosed—which pre-casts its own closedness—is, in an ontological-existential sense, an attunement toward the undisclosed that pre-casts its own disclosure. In other words, it is an attunement toward a way of being.

The pre-cast shadow is maintained by the being whose essence is to engage with the being of beings by responding to the call of Being itself. Being calls forth the

being of beings through disclosure for us, as we are the beings who respond. Being is always a question for us, and our way of being is to exist within and as Being. Our ontological constitution can thus be framed as an existential liminality that is transcendental—always belonging to what we are estranged from, reaffirming our place within Being precisely through that estrangement. This is what we refer to as the transliminal being of Being.

14.7. The Question as the Call of Being

Every question is ultimately the call of Being itself. Since any question that expects a singular response expresses Being's call, it follows that every question inherently anticipates one answer. Should any question—indeed, any question whatsoever—be considered problematic because of this expectation?

Historically, two perspectives have emerged:

One argues that expecting a single answer is inherently limiting and problematic.

The other maintains that a singular answer is both necessary and inevitable.

Is not the historical situatedness of the transliminal being of Being—the human condition of existing within and beyond thresholds—the primary matter upon which this issue hinges?

While Being calls to us and we respond with a singular answer, this "singular answer" is the response of a being whose structure is individual and finite—bounded by aspects such as birth and death or body and mind—each instance colored by "my ownmost" way of being. Therefore, it is not the unidirectional nature of the transliminal being that should raise concern regarding the nature of questioning.

Rather, the concern lies in the historical situationality of the transliminal being of Being.

14.8. The Genealogical Relationality of the Transliminal Being

The situational character of the transliminal being is permeated by genealogical relationality. Every call is an expression that both forwards and furthers phenomena. Each phenomenon has a call that propels it forward, and in doing so, it furthers the very phenomenon that initiated it.

14.9. Temporality and Proximal Attunement

Because every phenomenon is simultaneously a calling forward and a further calling, all phenomena are interconnected through these genealogical relationships. They reveal their meaning through the way they demonstrate what the calling is—as an attunement toward the beings of Being, involving both calling and responding.

The temporality of the transliminal being is situational, manifested through relationships of proximity. This proximity is characterized by general attunement—the way in which "this speaks on behalf of that" in the most general form of being oriented toward Being itself.

Thus, the genealogical relationality of every phenomenon is shaped by this proximal attunement toward Being. Each call resonates within other calls, attuning all toward the very Being of Being itself. In other words, every phenomenon embraces every other phenomenon to which it is genealogically related, according to their proximity to the call of Being. Furthermore, every phenomenon contains within itself the temporal structure of the way for the transliminal being to be.

Section 15: On Engagement Through the Lens of Reflexive Impermanation

15.1. Addressing the Challenge to the Transliminal Ontologic

A potential challenge to the framework of the Transliminal Ontologic, specifically regarding reflexive impermanation, might be raised as follows:

"How can you claim that birth, life, and death are 'moments' that constitute consciousness? Consciousness does not 'create' these moments as your theory of reflexive impermanation seems to suggest. It is a clear, biological, empirical fact that a person is born, lives a full life, and then experiences organic death. Consciousness, as far as can be objectively and empirically determined, comes after birth. How, then, could consciousness 'create' this 'moment'?"

15.2. Responding to the Challenge

In response to this challenge, it is important to clarify that while there is indeed a biological birth and death, this is not the primary focus of the theory of reflexive impermanation or the Transliminal Ontologic. The issue arises from a misunderstanding of what is meant by engagement in this context.

15.3. Consciousness and the Experience of Birth

Whether consciousness directly engages with the experience of birth—the event itself—is a question that need not detain us here. This is because, for most of us, memory does not provide access to this event in an explicit way; we cannot reconstitute the event of our own birth imaginatively as we can with other events.

15.4. The Ontological Engagement with Birth

The ontological existentiality of the phenomenologically engaged and genealogically grounded being of consciousness—the transliminal being of Being—does not engage birth as a biological situation. The consciousness of birth is either:

From the perspective of another, which, while important within the Transliminal Ontologic, pertains to a different context.

As a concept of 'birth', which is an idea or conceptualization.

In terms of the self-containment of consciousness—its sense of mineness, of being a "self"—this conceptualization of birth plays a role in constituting consciousness. Our being engages with its own birth as a conceptualized event, serving as a constituting principle of consciousness.

15.5. Experience as a Structure

Experience is inherently structural. For example, consider an individual who has been cheated on in a relationship. This event may have such an intense impact that it formulates a particular perception—a defensive mechanism projecting the event of "being cheated on" onto future partners, regardless of their actions.

15.6. The Role of Perception in Structuring Experience

Over time, this perception is "funded" by various encounters that seem to validate it, even if the partner is not actually cheating. The individual might interpret innocent behaviors as signs of infidelity, leading to a moment where they believe they have "caught" their partner in the act.

The individual's experience is shaped by their perception, which projects past harm onto present situations. This perception is structurally similar to the original event,

giving it meaning and emotional resonance. The structure was created by the individual to defend against future harm.

15.7. Consciousness Engaging with Structures

Consciousness is that which experiences; it engages with structures formed by perception. Perception, in this context, determines forms of encounter, engagement, and involvement by delineating and defining boundaries based on previous experiences.

Thus, a fundamental aspect of consciousness is structural engagement.

15.8. Fundamental Structures of Consciousness: Birth, Life, and Death

If structural engagement is part of the being of consciousness, then birth, life, and death as "moments" are fundamental structures that formulate the possibilities for consciousness's engagement.

Consciousness engages with its own birth conceptually, as a perception. The factuality of one's own birth comes via:

Reports from others.

Observations of others' births, which are themselves often reported rather than directly experienced.

15.9. The Role of Death in Consciousness

For consciousness to engage with "life," it must also engage with "death." The perception of life is funded by the concept of death. Both birth and death are given through:

Historical reports from others.

Engagement with the biological death or birth of others.

These "moments," which are not given by the self but by others, serve as anchors for perception to define, delimit, and construct modes of engagement in the world—fundamental structures of consciousness.

15.10. Reflexive Impermanation and the Being of Consciousness

In this way, consciousness can engage with the world by having delimited perspectives. Reflexive impermanation is the theory that the being of consciousness depends upon the production of "moments" by perception, which is a separate component of the human's being, so that it has a way to proceed in the world as its own phenomenon.

15.11. Avoiding Misconceptions About Engagement and the World

Extending this elaboration beyond a response to empirical challenges, it is important to clarify misconceptions:

The being of the human is not "interwoven into the fabric" of "the world" in the sense of a pre-existing structure.

The being of the human—the transliminal being of Being—has a form of engagement, but it cannot be accurately described as engaging with the world in a predefined way.

Discussing "a world out there" is nonsensical within this framework.

15.12. Engagement as a Way of Being

Instead, engagement should be understood as pointing toward a way that conveys meaning through the hermeneutical circle. It is not about interacting with a pre-existing world but about how meaning arises through engagement.

This highlights the need to avoid implying a dualistic or externalized concept of the world or engagement, where the world is something "out there" that we interact with. Instead, the "form of engagement" refers to a way of being that reveals itself through the hermeneutical circle, without implying a strict subject-object relationship.

15.13. The Self-Revealing Nature of Engagement

The being of the human is not an entity that encounters a pre-existing structure called "the world." Rather, it is a form of engagement, a way that reveals itself through each instance of meaning, each articulation that points us toward what we call existence.

This engagement is not a given, nor can it be taken as a static relation to something outside itself. What reveals itself through this engagement is what calls forth meaning. To speak of "existence" here is to enter the hermeneutical articulation of belonging and changing—a perpetual unfolding of meanings that point not toward an external world but toward the very conditions under which meaning itself arises.

15.14. Belonging and Changing as Co-constitutive Expressions

"Belonging" and "changing" are not sequential moments but co-constitutive expressions:

Belonging is the form in which one finds oneself always already situated—not in a world but in relation to what shows itself as meaningful. It articulates the relationality of one's own self.

Changing is the ekstastic multidimensionality that opens up the potential for meaning to reformulate and leap into new articulations.

Together, these articulations form the hermeneutical circle, where appearances relate to other appearances, and each meaning reflects and reshapes the next.

15.15. The Invocative Call as Expression of Engagement

At the heart of this structure is the invocative call, not as a discourse between subject and object, but as the directional pull that reveals the transliminal being's ownmost way of engaging with Being.

The call is not toward something external, nor does it aim to draw things into relation with a pre-existing self. Instead, the invocative call is the very expression of engagement itself—a pointing, a drawing, a coming-into-being. Through this call, meaning emerges not from an external encounter but from the potentiality always already within the engagement.

15.16. The Transliminal Ontologic as Form of Engagement

The Transliminal Ontologic is this form of engagement—the essential structure by which meanings come to be and are. It is not that things exist in a world and we engage them; rather, meanings show themselves in relation to this engagement.

Thus, the existentials of being-along-the-way-to-be is precisely this: a process not of external encounters but of the human's being revealing itself as it expresses itself through its ownmost potentialities.

15.17. Revisiting Heidegger's "Being-in-the-World"

In this context, Heidegger's concept of "Being-in-the-World" ("in-der-Welt-sein") may be seen as too constricting for the existential analytic of our being. While the notion of the hermeneutical circle is derived from Heidegger, his reliance on "Being-in-the-World" limits his understanding.

We replace this with "going-along-the-way" and, more fundamentally, "being-with-in-and-as". Here, "going-along-the-way" is akin to his notion of existentiality, and "being-with-in-and-as" corresponds to "in-der-Welt-sein".

15.18. Conclusion: The Transliminal Being of Being

In conclusion, the being of the human—the transliminal being of Being—is characterized by a form of engagement that is not about interacting with an external world but about the unfolding of meaning through engagement itself. This perspective reframes our understanding of consciousness, experience, and existence, emphasizing the intrinsic processes that constitute our being.